26756

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* MARGARET J. GARRITTY

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS ON THEFT: A LABORATORY EXPERIMENT

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/*GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* DR. T. HARTNAGEL

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* OCT. 17/75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* M. J. Garritty

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* 64 MISSION AVENUE
ST. ALBERT, ALBERTA

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS ON THEFT: A LABORATORY EXPERIMENT

by

MARGARET J. GARRITTY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR MARGARET J. GARRITTY

TITLE OF THESIS THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS ON THEFT: A LABORATORY EXPERIMENT

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF ARTS - SOCIOLOGY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1975

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

64 Mission Avenue

St. Albert

Alberta

DATED August 1 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE EFFECTS OF VICTIM CHARACTERISTICS ON THEFT: A LABORATORY EXPERIMENT

submitted by MARGARET J. GARRITTY

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of ARTS - SOCIOLOGY

J J Hartnagel

Supervisor

Brenda J. Rule

Michael W. Gillespie

Date August 1, 1975

ABSTRACT

Attention in criminological theory and research has recently shifted to an examination of the effects of particular victims in criminal situations. In the present study, literature discussing the effects of victims was reviewed. On the basis of this review, it was hypothesized that victim effects can range in intensity from actual precipitation of the offense to simply making a person conscious of a particular criminal opportunity, increasing the offender's motivation, or facilitating the crime. In less serious offenses, it is likely that more subtle factors play an important role in determining the deviant act.

The present study examined the impact of two factors of a victim, his need and his moral behavior, on the likelihood of his being victimized in an experimental situation. Hence subjects were given the opportunity to steal from a confederate who had either displayed immoral behavior through stealing from another victim, or had displayed moral behavior through competing honestly. The confederate's need for money was also manipulated to examine the effects of this factor as a justification for stealing. The general hypotheses regarding these two factors were that when a subject is faced with an opportunity to steal money from someone else, he is more likely to steal from a victim who displayed criminal or immoral tendencies and who expressed little need for money. In addition, the experiment examined the effect of the confederate's behavior on the tendency for subjects to steal from a fictitious third party.

The results of the study support the view that victims play an important role in determining their own victimization. Subjects stole considerably more often and more money from the confederate who had displayed immoral behavior and did not need money from the experiment. Several explanations for the observed effects, primarily based on equity theory, were provided and the limitations of the study were specified and discussed.

The major conclusion from the study was that increased attention to the victim should be made in further research in order to clarify the nature of the relationship between the victim and the offender in criminal and deviant situations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of my committee in the preparation of this thesis - particularly Andy Harrell for the considerable advice and guidance he provided during the course of this endeavor.

Most especially, I would like to thank Bill Avison for his excellent acting skills and the hours of laughter involved in the preparation of the videotapes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		ix
Chapter		
I	THEORETICAL DISCUSSION	1
	Review of the Literature	1
	Discussion on the Proposed Study	5
	Hypotheses	9
II	THE EXPERIMENT	13
	Method	13
	Subjects	13
	Apparatus	14
	Procedure	17
	Conditions	20
	Manipulation Checks and Debriefing	22
III	RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT	24
	Methods of Analysis	24
	Results	24
	Manipulation Checks	24
	Main Effects	27
	Interaction Effects	31
	Moral Behavior - Need Interaction	31
	Moral Behavior - Opponent Interaction	32
	Interaction of Opponent and Confederate's Need	35
	Interaction of Moral Behavior, Need and the Opponent	38
	Additional Findings	43
	Discussion	45
IV	DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	46
	Introduction	46
	Discussion of the Results of the Study	48
	Limitations of the Study	52
	Conclusions	56

Chapter Page

V SO WHAT? 58

BIBLIOGRAPHY 61

APPENDICES

A Manipulation Check Questionnaire 64

B Videotape Script 68

C Analysis of Variance Tables 74

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of Conditions and Hypothesized Relationships ..	10
2	Ratings of Honesty of Confederate	26
3	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing	28
4	Mean Number of Cents Stolen	28
5	Effect of Confederate's Need on Stealing	29
6	Effects of Victim on Stealing	30
7	Effects of Need on Stealing when Confederate was Dishonest	31
8	Effects of Need on Stealing when Confederate was Honest	32
9	Effects of the Opponent when the Confederate was Dishonest	33
10	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing when the Victim was Confederate	34
11	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing when Victim was the Other Subject	34
12	Effects of the Victim on Stealing when Confederate did not Need Money	36
13	Effects of the Victim on Stealing when Confederate Needed Money	36
14	Subject's Mean Reported Financial Position	37
15	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing from Confederate when Confederate does not Need Money	38
16	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing from Confederate when Confederate Needed Money	39
17	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing from the Other Subject when Confederate did need Money	39
18	Effects of Moral Behavior on Stealing from the Other Subject when Confederate Needed Money	40

Table		Page
19	Mean Amounts (in cents) Stolen for the Opponent X Need X Moral Behavior Interactions	41
20	Effect of Confederate's Need on Stealing from Dishonest Confederate	42
21	Effect of Confederate's Need on Stealing from the Other Subject when the Confederate was Dishonest	42
22	Interaction of Confederate's Need with Amounts of Money Stolen in Two Time Periods	44
23	Rates of Stealing in each Condition	46
24	Ranking of Conditions by Rates of Stealing Observed	47
25	Ranking of Conditions by Mean Amounts of Money Stolen (in cents)	47

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

Review of the Literature

Attention in criminological literature has recently shifted from its customary emphasis on the offender to a concern with characteristics of the victim which may have an important effect on his likelihood of being "victimized". As Schafer (1968) states:

> ... the goddess Justinia probably was impartial and knew the law very well, but her blindfold deprived her of the sight of complex interactions, group characteristics, and social problems. The criminal-victim relationship, like many other aspects of crime, therefore remained unknown to her.

Like Justinia, sociologists have largely remained blind to the role which the victim plays in causing crime.

It is the purpose of this thesis to review the literature concerning characteristics of persons which may lead to their being victimized. Several of these factors will then be examined in an experimental situation to test their impact on deviant behavior.

Most criminological literature has concentrated on characteristics of the offender or societal reactions to his offence in an attempt to "explain" deviant behavior. The victim has largely been regarded as a more or less "innocent bystander". Although early criminologists hinted at the importance of the victim, the field of "victimology" has not evolved from these early beginnings into a

systematic body of literature concerning the implications of the criminal-victim relationship. As Nagel (1963) has pointed out:

> We thought we were well on the road of progress when everything regarding the offender . . . could be measured, weighed and counted, and when we classified the criminal using real or invented systems. But the main point was neglected, viz, the relationships in which the delinquent commits his crime.

One such neglected relationship is that between the criminal and the victim.

Recent attention in this area has been in response to an article by H. von Hentig (1948) which hypothesized that:

> ... in a sense, the victim shapes and molds the criminal and his crime and that the relationship between perpetrator and victim may be much more intricate than our criminal law, with its rough and mechanical definitions and distinctions, would suggest.

He explains the relationship between the criminal and his victim in the following manner:

> Here are two human beings. As soon as they draw near to one another ... a wide range of interactions, repulsions as well as attractions, is set in motion. What the law does is watch the one who acts and the one who is acted upon. By this external criterion a subject and object, a perpetrator and a victim are distinguished. In sociological and psychological quality the situation may be completely different. It may happen that the two distinct categories merge. There are cases in which they are reversed and in the long chain of causative forces the victim assumes the role of a determinant. ... I maintain that many criminal deeds are more indicative of a subject-object relation than of a perpetrator alone. There is a definite mutuality of some sort. ... In the long process leading gradually to the

> unlawful result, credit and debit are not infrequently indistinguishable. ... Often victims seem to be born. Often they are society-made. Sometimes the most valuable qualities render us easy victims.

Reckless (1961) has also pointed to the importance of the victim and has stated that:

> Crime as behavior is symptomatic not only of the perpetrator but of the relation between doer and sufferer, for many victims have a special proneness to be victimized and are in a sense responsible for invoking criminal behavior.

In response to this emphasis on the victim as a participant in his own demise, von Hentig, as well as others (Mendelsohn, 1956; Barnes and Teeters, 1959; Reckless, 1961), have attempted to develop typologies of victims based on either characteristics of the victim or of his behavior in criminal situations. Research that has been done (Wolfgang, 1958; Gibson and Klein, 1961; Gillies, 1965; Schafer, 1965), has dealt primarily with demographic variables (e.g. sex, race, age, socio-economic status, etc.) that can be easily obtained from official crime statistics. This research has also tended to concentrate on "spectacular" crimes such as homicide or assault where the victim's position and relationship to the offender are generally more obvious. The results of these studies have lent general support to von Hentig's emphasis on the role of the victim. For example, Wolfgang (1958), in reviewing his findings on the victim-offender relationship in homicides, states that:

> Societal attitudes are generally positive toward the victim and negative toward the offender, who is often feared as a violent and dangerous threat to

> others. However, data in the present study - especially that of previous arrest record - mitigate, destroy, or reverse these connotations of victim-offender roles in one out of every four criminal homicides.

Wolfgang found that 26% of the homicide cases were in fact victim-precipitated; that is, the victim was the first to resort to force or the use of a weapon. In these cases, a comparison of demographic data and circumstantial aspects of the crime, shows the victims of victim-precipitated murders to be more similar to the offenders of non-victim-precipitated murders. In the remaining homicide cases (those not victim-precipitated), only 14.4% of the victims were unknown to the offender, leading to the inference that the victim could have played an important, though more subtle role, in these cases as well.

It is hypothesized in this thesis that in less serious criminal offenses certain characteristics of the victim may also play an important role in determining victimization. As Schafer (1968) points out, the effects of the victim can range in intensity from actual precipitation where the victim is the aggressor, to simply making a person conscious of a particular criminal opportunity, increasing the offender's motivation or facilitating the crime. In less serious offenses, then, a personal relationship between victim and offender is not necessary. As Wolfgang (1958) points out:

> In most crimes the personal relationship between victim and offender plays a less significant role than in homicide. In other offenses, external precipitating factors that operate upon the motivation of an offender do not require a highly personalized victim.

However, Wolfgang tends to overlook the less obvious role a victim may play in crimes other than homicide. Assuming differences in intensity of victim effects, it is probable that more subtle factors of the victim play an equally, if not more important role, in determining probability of victimization.

Discussion on the Proposed Study

On the basis of these inferences from the literature on victimology, a study was designed relating characteristics of a victim to the probability of being "robbed" in an experimental situation. In this case, the experimental setting was chosen because it permitted the manipulation of more subtle victim characteristics. Two characteristics of a victim were chosen for manipulation in this study: (1) the victim's own moral behavior, and (2) the victim's need for money. The general hypotheses regarding these two factors were that when a subject is faced with an opportunity to steal money from someone else, he is more likely to steal from a victim who displays criminal or immoral tendencies and who expresses little need for money than from someone who is moral and needs money.

Victim's moral behavior and his need for money were selected primarily on the basis of their logical relationship to theft. In terms of moral behavior, the argument is that a victim who treats others unethically deserves to be treated that way himself. This basically reflects the "eye for an eye" philosophy which is predominant in equity research (Walster, Bersheid and Walster, 1973) and exchange theory (Homans, 1962). According to equity theory, an

act which injures another is not unjust if, indeed, the victim deserves to be harmed. Along these lines, studies on rape (Jones and Aronson, 1973) and traffic accident victims (Landy and Aronson, 1969) have shown that hypothetical jurors tend to recommend less severe sentences for offenders if the victim was disreputable or immoral. Wolfgang's research (1958) also lends support to the possible effect of the victim's moral behavior, especially regarding the cases of victim-precipitated homicide. He found that 62% of the victims in these cases had a previous record of offenses against the person (i.e., assault). In his early discussion of the role of the victim, von Hentig (1948) suggests that the moral behavior of the victim acts as a rationalization and consequently overthrows the inhibitions of the offender. He contends that:

> A philosophy of 'he asked for it' or 'it serves him right' comes into play. The moral inferiority of the victim bestows not only practical but moral immunity, especially when the victim is well to do and the offender hard up.

Along these lines, Sykes and Matza (1957) have discussed the importance of neutralizing sentiments as preparatory to commiting a crime. They argue that such neutralizing sentiments or rationalizations not only protect the individual from self blame and the blame of others after the act but also precede the deviant behavior and in fact, make the deviant behavior possible.

In the present study, a situation was established in which the subject observed a confederate who either stole or did not steal from a fictitious third party. It was expected that the confederate

who stole would be regarded as dishonest and consequently, stealing from him would be justifiable to re-establish equity in the situation.

In the case of the victim's need, the basis for the hypothesized relationship can also be found in equity theory. This reflects what Smigel and Ross (1970) have termed the "Robin Hood myth". Specifically, it is considered less reprehensible to some extent to steal from a victim who has larger assets than the criminal. Smigel (1970) has investigated reasons for theft from large business firms and has found that 68% of those caught stealing rationalized that the organization could easily afford the loss and consequently, stealing from them was to some extent justifiable. In the same study, Smigel also found that 8% rationalized that the organization was ruthless and cheated others and consequently deserved to be robbed. As pointed out earlier, von Hentig has suggested that these same two factors are of importance in the selection of individual victims as well.

The present study takes into account the confederate's need for money to determine what effect this factor may have on stealing. The confederate who indicates at the beginning of the experiment that he needs money and then goes on to steal from the third subject will make a different impression than the confederate who says he does not need money but who also steals. In the former case, it was expected that the confederate's need would be considered as a legitimate motive for stealing and consequently, stealing from him would not be as likely. When the confederate does not need money, his theft would be considered purposeless and intended only to hurt

his victim. It was expected that subjects would steal from this confederate in order to retain equity in the situation.

Because of the nature of the experiment, it was expected that the confederate's behavior, either honest or dishonest would have a modelling effect on the subject's own behavior. Observing the confederate's deviant behavior should lower the subject's inhibitions about performing similar deviant acts, in this case, stealing. This prediction is suggested by Bandura and Walters' (1963) discussion of the effect of modelling on deviant responses. We also expected that an honest confederate should inhibit the subject's stealing behavior. There are countless examples of models facilitating prosocial behaviors, such as giving help to others (Krebs, 1970). There are to our knowledge, however, no studies of an honest model deterring theft. In the present study we expect this inhibitory effect of the honest model to be greatest when he states that he really needs money and, yet, is able to resist the temptation to steal and manages to win anyway. Since the confederate does win, the impression the subject should receive is one of virtue triumphing over the temptation to win dishonestly. We would expect that the subject who observes an honest confederate who nevertheless badly needs the money to experience greater feelings of guilt when he is put in the position of having to steal than is the case for the subject who observes an honest confederate who does not need the money. In the latter condition the confederate's honesty entails less of a potential sacrifice or cost since his need for money is much less. As a consequence, the moral credibility of this model should be less than that of the needy but honest model.

In order to attempt to separate out and control for the possible modelling effect, the experiment was designed so that only half of the subjects were able to compete against and steal from the confederate whose moral behavior and need for money had been observed in the first phase of the experiment. The other half of the subjects competed against and could steal from the fictitious third subject. Since the subject has no information on which to base a judgment of the fictitious third subject, it was expected that stealing from him would more clearly represent the modelling impact of the confederate's behavior. In this case, the subject not only is provided with a deviant model but also with a convenient rationale for stealing, i.e., need for money. On the other hand, stealing from the confederate should reflect a judgment of the confederate and an attempt on the part of the subject to retain equity in the situation.

Hypotheses

A summary of the conditions and their hypothesized effect on theft is shown in Table 1. The condition in which the subject can steal from a dishonest confederate who has little need for money should evoke the greatest amount of stealing. The reason for this is that the subject can take money from the perpetrator of the crime, i.e., from the confederate; also, in this condition the confederate has no appropriate motive, such as a need for money, which might justify what he has done. Theft by this particular confederate is apt to be perceived as particularly frivolous or malicious.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS AND

HYPOTHESIZED RELATIONSHIPS

	S's Potential Victim			
	Confederate		Third Person	
Confederate's Rationale	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate
Need	7	2	8	3
No Need	5	1	6	4

1 = condition yielding the greatest likelihood of theft

8 = condition yielding the least likelihood of theft

Subjects who can steal from a dishonest confederate who is needy should show the second greatest amount of theft. Following closely behind is the condition in which subjects have observed a needy and dishonest confederate, but are permitted to steal from the confederate's previous victim rather than from the confederate himself. The reason for ranking these two conditions this way is because, while observing a needy thief should provide a neutralizing rationale for stealing from the third subject, the fact that this individual has been previously victimized should inhibit to some extent further exploitation. As a result, subjects who compete against the needy and dishonest confederate should steal more because

he has won before and would not suffer as much from an equity standpoint as would the third subject who was victimized a second time.

Ranked fourth is the condition in which subjects can steal from the third subject after observing a non-needy dishonest model. The basis for ranking this condition lower than the one in which the third subject is the potential victim and a needy dishonest model has been observed, is that the model in this latter condition provides an excuse for stealing which is not provided by the non-needy deviant model. On the other hand, the fact that the confederate has provided a deviant model should elicit more theft directed toward the third subject than would be the case if an honest model has been observed.

We now turn to the conditions in which the subject is exposed to an honest model. The outcomes of these conditions are more difficult to predict since there is no clear explanation for predicting different rates of stealing in response to an honest model. In the previous conditions where subjects see the deviant confederate, the modelling effect of his stealing is the most important factor. Where the confederate's need can be used by subjects as an excuse for stealing in the dishonest conditions, in the honest conditions, the confederate's need should inhibit theft.

The following is a tentative explanation of how subjects might respond in the honest confederate conditions. The least amount of stealing is expected from the third party when the subject has been exposed to an honest and needy confederate. The model provided is the most morally credible model since he needs money and resists the temptation to steal. However, the third party has already lost once,

therefore the least amount of stealing is expected from him rather than from the confederate himself.

The conditions ranked fifth and sixth would be as follows. In both conditions the subject is exposed to an honest model with no need for money. The confederate has every reason to be honest since he has no need for the money. In this case, then, more stealing would be expected from the confederate himself since he has already won once and does not need the money. This condition would consequently be ranked fifth with sixth ranking given to the condition where the third subject is the potential victim.

The hypotheses dealing with the conditions in which the third subject is the victim are of necessity somewhat tenuous. The predictions of stealing from the confederate himself follow fairly directly from the previous theoretical discussion. Conditions involving the third subject, however, were added primarily as a basis for examining the modelling effect of the confederate's deviance and therefore, the theoretical rationale does not form as sound a basis for predicting stealing in these conditions.

CHAPTER II

THE EXPERIMENT

Method

Subjects. In order to examine the hypotheses outlined above a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design was proposed. Twelve subjects were assigned to each of eight conditions; half of the subjects in each condition were males, the other half females. All subjects were volunteers who were recruited from introductory Sociology courses with the promise of making money. They were told that they could expect to make from $2.00 to $4.00 for taking part. At the end of the experiment, all subjects were paid $3.00 plus any amount they had won during the experiment.

A total of 118 subjects took part in the experiment. Of these, the results from 96 of the subjects were included in the study. On the basis of each subject's responses on a manipulation check questionnaire as well as comments made during a debriefing interview, the remainder (22) of the subjects were eliminated from the study. The following criteria were used as a basis for elimination:[1] (a) failure to believe that the other two subjects were actually present (4); (b) suspicion that the confederate was, in fact, a confederate in the experiment (3); (c) failure to notice the

[1]The numbers in brackets indicate the number of subjects eliminated for each of the criteria.

manipulation of the independent variables, specifically whether or not the confederate needed money and whether or not he exhibited immoral behavior (4); (d) suspicion of the actual purpose of the experiment (6); (e) failure to understand how stealing was possible (4); (f) personal acquaintance with the confederate (1). It is interesting to note that more males were eliminated on the basis of suspicion. It was evident that males were reluctant to admit to the female experimenter that they had been deceived by the procedure of the experiment. Generally, more females were eliminated because they did not notice the manipulation of the independent variables or did not understand how stealing was possible.

The confederate employed in the experiment was a male resembling an average university student. Since his appearance did not differ significantly from the average student who volunteered for the experiment, most subjects accepted him as another subject and did not suspect him of being a confederate.

Apparatus. The experiment was set up as a competitive task involving button pressing. Subjects were told that they would receive money if they won their competition against one of the other two subjects taking part in the experiment (either the confederate or the alternate victim). A specially devised panel was used for the button pressing task. This panel was equipped with a button which the subjects were instructed to press as many times as possible. The more often the button was pressed, the higher would be the subject's cumulative score. The panel was equipped with two cumulative counters,

one for the subject and one for his opponent, so that the subject was aware of both his own and his opponent's score. Each count on the cumulative counters represented one cent. Stealing from an opponent could be achieved in the following manner: the panel used for the button pressing task was equipped with a switch labelled "Work Alone" vs. "Take Other's Money". If the switch was flipped to the "Take Other's Money" position, all the opponent's points were diverted to the subject's own cumulative score. Since each point represented one cent, flipping the switch in effect resulted in the theft of money from the opponent. Finally, the panel was connected to recording equipment so that the number of points stolen as well as when the stealing occurred were recorded automatically.

A series of eight videotapes were prepared for manipulating the independent variables. Video-tapes were employed as opposed to using a "live" confederate in order to eliminate several of the problems of using a "live" confederate. Aside from the simplifications in the procedure and scheduling which video-tapes offer, their use also ensures standardization of the confederate's behavior through eliminating problems arising from direct interaction between subject and confederate. The major problem involved with the use of video-tapes in this case was the necessity of ensuring that the subjects believed that the confederate was actually another subject and that he was present in another room at the time of the experiment. For this reason, the subjects were given a fictitious purpose for watching the confederate on the television monitor. They were told that because three subjects would be taking part in the experiment at the

same time, television monitors had been set up so that the experimenter would only have to give the complete set of instructions for the task to one of the subjects while the others watched on the television monitors. The subjects were told that this would save time for the experimenter and ensure that each subject received the same instructions for the task. Also, special attempts were made both on the video-tapes and during the experiment, to ensure continuity between the video-taped and the "live" portions of the experiment. To test the believability of the video-tapes, the experiment was pretested on twelve subjects. Several modifications both in the script and the procedure of the experiment were made to ensure that the subjects would accept the entire format of the experiment, particularly the presence of the confederate and the second victim.

Two questionnaires were also used in the experiment. At the beginning of the experiment, each subject was given a self-esteem questionnaire primarily to disguise the actual purpose of the experiment. The second questionnaire was administered at the end of the experiment and was designed as a check on the manipulation of the independent variables. Subjects were asked to respond to questions indicating whether or not they had stolen from their opponent, their opinions of both the confederate and the second victim, possible reasons for their stealing or not stealing, as well as their personal financial position. Questions were also included which were designed to check the subject's attentiveness to the video-tapes to ensure that each subject was aware of both the confederate's need and whether

or not he displayed immoral behavior. A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Procedure. All subjects were told that they were to take part in an experiment concerning competitive behavior and were led to believe that three subjects were taking part in the experiment at the same time. In actuality, only one subject was present. The second subject was completely fictitious and the third subject seen on video-tape was the confederate.

The subject was taken to a separate room equipped with a television monitor and button pressing machine. The subject was given the self-esteem questionnaire to complete and told that each of the three subjects had been placed in separate rooms to avoid direct interaction between them. The following instructions were then given to each subject:

In this experiment, we are concerned with people's behavior in different types of situations - in this case, it's a competitive situation. Three of you, we'll call you Subject 1, Subject 2, and Subject 3, have been randomly chosen to compete in this experiment and have been randomly assigned to three separate rooms. We want to avoid any direct interaction between you so we've put you each in separate rooms. You will be called Subject 1. Also on the basis of random selection, the following order of competitions has been set up. First, Subject 2 will compete against Subject 3. In order to cut down on the number of subjects needed, one of them will be randomly selected to compete twice. You'll find out after the first competition which subject you'll be competing against.

This section of the instructions was designed to provide a rationale for the experiment and to explain the format for the competitions. The subject was told he would compete against either the confederate or the second victim on the basis of random selection so that he would not be suspicious of the actual purpose of the experiment. In actuality, half of the subjects competed against the confederate while the other half competed against the fictitious third individual. Subjects were not told which subject they would compete against until after the first competition between the confederate and the third person.

The next section of the instructions read to the subject was as follows:

Before we get started, I'd like to ask each of you a few questions. We're interested in people's reasons for signing up for these experiments; why some people sign up while others don't. Did you know you would be paid for taking part in this experiment? ... What were your reasons for signing up? ... You have a chance to make some money on the competitive task. Do you need the money?

This section of the instructions was included primarily as a means for manipulating the financial need of the confederate. When the full instructions were given to the confederate on the video-tapes, the experimenter asked the same questions to him and, in this way, the subject was made aware of the confederate's need for money.

In the final section of the instructions, the experimenter explained the purpose of the television monitor. These instructions were as follows:

In order to save time and to save me from having to repeat the instructions for the competitive task three times, we've set up these television monitors in two of the rooms. Two of you will be able to watch me give the full instructions to the third subject, in this case, Subject 3, by means of the television monitor. Your instructions are exactly the same as those for Subject 3 so please listen carefully. Subject 3 is not aware that he is being televised. Please don't be worried - there's no hidden television equipment in this room - we are not interested in watching your behavior. You will be able to see Subject 3 compete against Subject 2 in the first competition but the camera will be turned off before you compete. The procedure should be completely clear to you by then so there's no need for you to watch any longer. Please listen carefully so you'll know when it's your turn to compete and which subject you're competing against.

The experimenter then turned on the television monitor and left the room supposedly to go to give the complete instructions to Subject 3, the confederate.

The subject received the complete instructions for the button pressing task and the mechanism for stealing points by means of the video-tapes. On the video-tapes the experimenter explained to the confederate how the panel worked, specifically, that the subject had to press the button on the panel to make points and that his points as well as his opponent's would appear on the respective cumulative counters. He was told that each point corresponded to one cent and

that in order to receive the money on his counter, he would have to win his competition. The loser would receive nothing. The confederate then interrupted the experimenter to ask the purpose of the other switch on the panel. In order to reduce demand characteristics, the experimenter gave a fictitious purpose for the switch, specifically, that it was being used for another experiment on cooperation, but carefully explained what the result would be if the switch was flipped to the "Take Other's Money" position. In this way the subject was made aware of the opportunity to steal points from his opponent but stealing was not made normative in the situation. Demand characteristics were also reduced by giving these instructions in this manner to the confederate via the video-tapes rather than personally to the real subject.

Conditions

All manipulations of the independent variables were done via the video-tapes. As previously discussed, the confederate's need for money was manipulated through his responses to the experimenter's questions about his reasons for volunteering for the experiment. Two need conditions, need and no need, were established. In the no need condition, the confederate commented that he did not know he would be paid for the experiment and that he had volunteered for the experiment only on the basis of curiosity. He stated that he had no need for the money from the experiment. In the need condition, the confederate again commented that he did not know he would be paid but was pleased to find this out since he needed the money.

The confederate's moral behavior was operationalized in the following manner. As stated in the instructions to the subject, each subject had the opportunity to watch the confederate compete on the first competitive task against the third subject. During the course of his competition against the third person, the confederate either competed honestly and did not steal points from his opponent or was dishonest and flipped the switch to steal points. Since each point corresponded to one cent, the confederate was actually taking money from him. In this manner, two conditions, moral confederate and immoral confederate, were established. In all conditions, the confederate won his first competition against his opponent regardless of whether or not he stole points. During this first competition in the "immoral" treatment the video-tape clearly showed the confederate using the "Take Money" switch and the points being transferred to his counter.

The third variable, which person the subject competed against, was manipulated by telling the subject that, on a random basis, he would be competing against either the confederate or the third party. Thus, on video-tapes, at the end of the confederate's first competition, the experimenter remarked that the confederate had won his competition. In half the cases, where the subject was to compete against the confederate, the confederate was then told that he had been randomly selected to compete again, this time against Subject 1. In these cases, then, the confederate became the potential victim for the real subject. In the remainder of the cases, where the subject was to compete against the third party, the confederate was told that

Subject 2, who had lost against the confederate, had been randomly selected to compete again, but this time against Subject 1. The confederate was then given the post-experiment questionnaire to compete and the tape ended. In these cases, Subject 2 became the real subject's potential victim.

In all conditions, each subject filled out the self-esteem questionnaire, was given the instructions for the experiment, watched the video-taped portion of the experiment, then competed against either the confederate or the third party. The opponent's behavior on the button pressing task against the real subject was simulated by an electromechanical device and was fixed so that the real subject could not win and consequently would not receive any money unless he stole points from his opponent. It was felt that providing a strong incentive to take points would ensure more variation in the dependent variable, namely, the probability of stealing.

Manipulation Checks and Debriefing

After competing, each subject was given the post-experiment questionnaire to complete. As discussed in the "Apparatus" section, this questionnaire was designed primarily to check the subject's attentiveness and responses to the manipulation of the independent variables.

Each subject was then given a debriefing interview based on the guidelines set by Aronson and Carlsmith (1968). This interview was designed to determine whether subjects were suspicious of the actual purpose of the experiment. Secondly, it was important to be

certain that subjects believed that the confederate and the second victim were present at the time and that they were not suspicious of the video-tapes or the confederate's behavior. Thirdly, because deception was involved, it was important to fully explain the purpose of the experiment and the need for deception techniques.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT

Methods of Analysis

Two types of statistical procedures were used to analyze the results obtained. Chi square was used on the nominal level variables, specifically to ascertain the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable of whether or not subjects stole from their opponent. An analysis of variance was applied to the interval-scaled dependent variable, the amount of money stolen, as well as the subjects' ratings of the confederate and the third person as reported in the manipulation check questionnaire.[2] The subject's expressed need for money was used as a covariate in an attempt to determine what effect, if any, this variable may have had on the amount of money stolen.

Results

Manipulation Checks. Subjects were asked to rate the honesty and fairness of both the confederate and the other subject. As was expected, the confederate's moral behavior significantly affected ratings of the confederate's honesty ($F = 23.40$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .001$) with subjects exposed to an honest confederate rating him as

---

[2] The analysis of variance test is a fairly robust method of analysis and technically the data should have been adjusted to account for the skewed distribution of results that was obtained. However, for the purposes of this thesis, it was agreed that this adjustment was unnecessary.

significantly more honest ($\bar{x}$ = 4.63) than subjects exposed to a dishonest confederate ($\bar{x}$ = 3.21). Similarly, the moral behavior of the confederate significantly influenced ratings of fairness ($F = 26.27$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .001$) with the confederate in the honest condition judged as more fair ($\bar{x}$ = 3.13)[3] than the confederate in the dishonest condition ($\bar{x}$ = 4.54).

Confederate's moral behavior also influenced ratings of the other subject's honesty ($F = 10.98$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .01$). The other subject was rated as significantly more honest ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65) when the confederate was dishonest as opposed to when the confederate was honest ($\bar{x}$ = 2.96). It appears that a contrast phenomenon was operating with the other subject being regarded as more honest when he had been victimized by the dishonest confederate. In contrast, the other subject is perceived as less honest in comparison to a confederate who does not steal. No other main effects were significant for ratings of the confederate.

The type of opponent and need both significantly affected judgments of the other subject's fairness. Thus, subjects who competed against the other subject rated him as more fair ($\bar{x}$ = 3.08) than did those subjects who competed against the confederate ($\bar{x}$ = 3.56) ($F = 5.45$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .05$). Finally, subjects who observed a "needy" confederate regarded the other subject as significantly more fair ($\bar{x}$ = 3.10) than did subjects who observed non-needy confederate ($\bar{x}$ = 3.54) ($F = 4.55$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .05$).

---

[3]The lower the score, the higher the fairness rating.

The only significant interaction term was the three-way term for ratings of the confederate's honesty ($F = 5.85$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .05$). Cell means for this interaction are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

RATINGS OF HONESTY OF CONFEDERATE

	Opponent was Confederate		Opponent was Other Subject	
	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate
Need	2.83	5.08	3.50	4.58
No Need	3.50	3.83	3.00	5.00

As was predicted, the confederate received the highest honesty rating from subjects competing against him when he refrained from stealing and yet, had a need for money. It was expected that the confederate would be judged the least honest when he stole money but had expressed no need for money. While this was true for subjects who competed against the other subject, this was not the case for subjects competing against the confederate. The confederate received the most dishonest rating when he was dishonest but needed money.

This possibility reflects the fact that the largest number of subjects stole from the confederate when he was dishonest and did not need money. It may have been difficult for subjects to rate the confederate as overly dishonest when they have just exhibited the same dishonest behavior.

This leads to a general problem involved in the interpretation of the results from the manipulation checks. While this issue will be discussed more thoroughly in Chapter 4, it is important at this point to point out the nature of the problem. It was expected that the manipulation checks could be used as an indicator of the subjects judgment of his victim. However, this proved to be a poor indicator because of the fact that subjects responded to the manipulation check questionnaire after they competed themselves. Consequently, their judgments reflect not only factors manipulated in the experiment but also the effects of the subject's own behavior in the competitive situation.

Regarding the manipulation check on the confederate's need for money, 91.7% (44) of the subjects who observed the "needy" confederate indicated on their questionnaire that, indeed the confederate was needy while 97.9% (47) of the subjects in the no-need condition indicated that confederate was not needy ($Chi^2 = 73.79$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$).

Main Effects

An analysis of the results for the main effects showed that the confederate's moral behavior was the strongest predictor of theft. As can be seen in Table 3, almost 46% of the subjects stole after viewing an immoral confederate as compared to only 4.2% of the subjects stealing in the honest confederate condition.

TABLE 3

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Dishonest Confederate	26 54.2%	22 45.8%	48
	Honest Confederate	46 95.8%	2 4.2%	48
		72	24	96

$Chi^2 = 20.0555$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$

These results were also reflected in the amount of money stolen where the confederate's honesty had the most statistically significant effect ($F = 13.34$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .001$). A comparison of the mean amounts stolen shows that when the confederate was honest, the mean amount stolen was only 2.08 cents while when he was dishonest, the mean amount rose to 13.67 cents. Table 4 represents the mean amounts stolen for each of the main effects.

TABLE 4

MEAN NUMBER OF CENTS STOLEN

			Mean Number of Cents Stolen
Independent Variables	Opponent	Confederate Other Subject	11.31 4.44
	Moral Behavior	Honest Confederate Dishonest Confederate	2.08 13.67
	Need	Need No Need	8.75 7.00

The confederate's expressed need for money was found not to have a significant main effect on either the subject's decision to steal or the amount of money stolen.

TABLE 5

EFFECT OF CONFEDERATE'S NEED ON STEALING

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Need	Need	37 77.1%	11 22.9%	48
	No Need	35 72.9%	13 27.1%	48
		72	24	96

$Chi^2 = .065$, df = 1, $p < .80$

As can be seen from Table 5 above, 27.1% of the subjects stole when the confederate had expressed no need for the money as compared to 22.9% who stole when he needed the money. Although these results are in the predicted direction, need did not have a significant effect.

Regarding the amount of money stolen, the confederate's expressed need for money was again found not to have a significant main effect ($F = .30$, df = 1/88, $p > .20$). As can be seen from Table 4, the mean amount stolen when the confederate needed money (mean = 8.75) was in fact higher than the mean when he did not need the money (mean = 7.00). It is evident that the confederate's need for money in itself was not accepted as a legitimate excuse for stealing.

The subject's opponent, either the confederate or the other subject, was found to have a significant effect both on stealing and on the amount of money stolen. Table 6 shows that subjects stole significantly more often from the confederate than from the other subject.

TABLE 6

EFFECTS OF VICTIM ON STEALING

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Opponent	Other Subject	41 85.4%	7 14.6%	48
	Confederate	31 64.6%	17 35.4%	48
		72	24	96

$Chi^2 = 4.50$, df = 1, $p < .03$

Regardless of all other conditions, 14.6% of the subjects stole from the other subject as compared to 35.4% who stole from the confederate. Similarly, subjects stole significantly more money from the confederate than from the other subject ($F = 4.70$, df = 1/88, $p < .05$). As can be seen from Table 4, the mean amount stolen from the confederate was 11.31 cents as compared to a mean of 4.44 cents stolen from the other subject. These results support the prediction that the opponent would have a significant effect on stealing.

Interaction Effects

Some of the most significant results obtained involved the effects of the interaction of the major independent variables on stealing. Examination of these results was necessary to obtain a complete picture of the effects of the independent variables. As will be seen from the interaction effects, the confederate's moral behavior had the most pervasive effect, in interaction with other variables, on the subject's decision to steal; however, his need for money and the nature of the subject's opponent also had an effect both on when the subject was most likely to steal and on the amount of money stolen.

Moral Behavior - Need Interaction. As was the case for the main effects, the need variable did not have a significant impact on the subject's decision to steal. A comparison of Tables 7 and 8 show that for both the honest and the dishonest confederate, approximately the same percentage of subjects stole as did not steal regardless of the confederate's need for money.

TABLE 7

EFFECTS OF NEED ON STEALING WHEN CONFEDERATE WAS DISHONEST

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Need	Need	13 54.2%	11 45.8%	24
	No Need	13 54.2%	11 45.8%	24
		26	22	48

$Chi^2 = .084$, df = 1, $p < .80$

TABLE 8

EFFECTS OF NEED ON STEALING WHEN CONFEDERATE WAS HONEST

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Need	Need	22 91.7%	2 8.3%	24
	No Need	24 100.0%	0 0.0%	24
		46	2	48

$Chi^2 = .52$, df = 1, $p < .50$

Similarly, the interaction of moral behavior and need did not significantly effect the amount of money stolen ($F = .58$, df = 1/88, $p > .20$).

Moral Behavior - Opponent Interaction. The results for the interaction of the confederate's moral behavior and the opponent (either confederate or the other subject) lend strong support to the hypotheses concerning victim effects. Table 9 shows that when the confederate was dishonest, 62.5% of the subjects stole from him in return while only 29.2% stole from the other subject.

TABLE 9

EFFECTS OF THE OPPONENT WHEN THE CONFEDERATE WAS DISHONEST

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Opponent	Other Subject	17 70.8%	7 29.2%	24
	Confederate	9 37.5%	15 62.5%	24
		26	22	48

$Chi^2 = 4.11$, $df = 1$, $p < .04$

When the confederate was honest, the opponent did not have a significant effect on stealing with none of the subjects stealing from the other subject and only 8.3% stealing from the confederate.

Furthermore, the confederate's moral behavior had the most significant effect when the confederate was also the victim.

TABLE 10

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING

WHEN THE VICTIM WAS CONFEDERATE

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Dishonest	9 37.5%	15 62.5%	24
	Honest	22 91.7%	2 8.3%	24
		31	17	48

$Chi^2 = 13.11$, $df = 1$, $p = < .0003$

TABLE 11

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING

WHEN VICTIM WAS THE OTHER SUBJECT

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Dishonest	17 70.8%	7 29.2%	24
	Honest	24 100.0%	0 0.0%	24
		41	7	48

$Chi^2 = 6.021$, $df = 1$, $p > .01$

Table 10 demonstrates the modelling impact of the confederate's moral behavior. Thus, we see that theft from the other subject is significantly more likely to occur if the subject has observed a dishonest rather than an honest model. Tables 10 and 11 point out that the disinhibitory effect of the confederate's deviance is obviously much greater when the confederate is the subject's opponent rather than the previously victimized subject indicating that factors other than modelling alone may come into play.

The interaction of moral behavior and the type of opponent did not have a significant effect on the amount of money stolen ($F = .73$, $df = 1/88$, $p > .20$) although the results are in the predicted direction. As will be seen in later discussions, the confederate's need had a somewhat confusing effect on the amount of money stolen from the other subject and probably accounts for the lack of significance of the interaction of moral behavior and victim.

Interaction of Opponent and Confederate's Need. A comparison of Tables 12 and 13 shows that the type of victim had a much clearer effect on the decision to steal when the confederate did not need money.

TABLE 12

EFFECTS OF THE VICTIM ON STEALING WHEN CONFEDERATE DID NOT NEED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Victim	Other Subject	23 95.8%	1 4.2%	24
	Confederate	14 58.3%	10 41.7%	24
		37	11	48

$Chi^2 = 7.548$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$

TABLE 13

EFFECTS OF THE VICTIM ON STEALING WHEN CONFEDERATE NEEDED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Victim	Other Subject	18 75.0%	6 25.0%	24
	Confederate	17 70.8%	7 29.2%	24
		35	13	48

$Chi^2 = 0$, $df = 1$, $p = 1.0000$

The interesting finding is that almost as many subjects stole from the other subject as from the confederate when need for money was involved.

An examination of the analysis of variance results for the opponent-need interaction shows that the interaction term was not statistically significant ($F = 1.43$, $df = 1/88$, $p > .20$).

A possible explanation for the effects of the confederate's need on stealing from the other subject lies in the fact that his need had a significant effect on the subject's own indication of need for money ($F = 10.26$, $df = 1/88$, $p. < .01$).[4] Subjects reported a greater personal need for money in the conditions where the confederate expressed need for money and the subject's opponent was the other subject.

TABLE 14

SUBJECT'S MEAN REPORTED FINANCIAL POSITION

		Confederate's Need	
		Need	No Need
Opponent	Confederate	4.54	3.92
	Other Subject	4.83	3.75

[4]Subject's own need for money was used as a covariate in the analysis of variance and was found not to have a significant effect on whether subjects stole or on how much money was stolen.

As an explanation for stealing from the other subject, it is possible that more subjects in this condition needed the money from the experiment. On the other hand, it could be that a modelling effect was present and that subjects tended to report a greater need when confederate also said he needed money. It is possible that subjects were using the same excuse for stealing as was the confederate. In order to clarify the relationship between need and the victim, it is necessary to look at the effects of moral behavior as well.

Interaction of Moral Behavior, Need and the Opponent. The results obtained from the combined effects of all three major variables are of considerable importance in understanding the complete picture of the experiment. As was predicted, the most significant results were obtained when the victim was the confederate and he did not need money.

TABLE 15

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING FROM CONFEDERATE WHEN CONFEDERATE DOES NOT NEED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Dishonest	2 16.7%	10 83.3%	12
	Honest	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	12
		14	10	24

$Chi^2 = 13.88$, df = 1, p = .0002

TABLE 16

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING

FROM CONFEDERATE WHEN CONFEDERATE NEEDED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Dishonest	7 58.3%	5 41.7%	12
	Honest	10 83.3%	2 16.7%	12
		17	7	24

$Chi^2 = .807$, df = 1, $p > .30$

TABLE 17

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING FROM THE

OTHER SUBJECT WHEN CONFEDERATE DID NOT NEED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Honest	12 100.0%	0 0.0%	12
	Dishonest	11 91.7%	1 8.3%	12
		23	1	24

$Chi^2 = 0.0$, df = 1, p = 1.00

TABLE 18

EFFECTS OF MORAL BEHAVIOR ON STEALING FROM THE OTHER SUBJECT WHEN CONFEDERATE NEEDED MONEY

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Moral Behavior	Honest	12 100%	0 0%	12
	Dishonest	6 50%	6 50%	12
		18	6	24

$Chi^2 = 5.56$, $df = 1$, $p < .02$

Tables 16 and 17 show that the most stealing occurred from the confederate when he did not need money. However, it was expected that the confederate's need for money would provide a rationale for his dishonesty and significantly decrease the amount of stealing from him. Table 16 shows that this was not in fact the case since almost as many subjects stole as did not steal from the confederate when he needed money. When the other subject was the victim, Table 17 shows that only one person stole from the other subject regardless of the confederate's dishonesty when he had expressed no need for money. However, when the confederate was dishonest and needed money, as many subjects stole as didn't steal from the other subject.

The three-way interaction was found to have a significant effect on the amount of money stolen ($F = 6.30$, $df = 1/80$, $p < .05$). The mean amounts stolen are presented in Table 19:

TABLE 19

MEAN AMOUNTS (IN CENTS) STOLEN FOR THE OPPONENT X NEED X MORAL BEHAVIOR INTERACTIONS

		Opponent			
		Confederate		Other Subject	
		Need	No Need	Need	No Need
Moral Behavior	Honest	8.33	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Dishonest	12.25	24.67	14.42	3.33

Table 19 shows that while more money was stolen from the confederate when he did not need money, the opposite is true when the victim was the other subject. The results were most significant in the predicted direction when the victim was the confederate and when he did not need money. The confederate's need for money decreased the amount of stealing from him but increased the amount of stealing from the other subject.

This relationship between need and stealing from the other subject is evident in the comparison of Tables 20 and 21.

These tables show that in the dishonest conditions need decreased the amount of stealing from the confederate. On the other hand the confederate's need appeared to increase the amount of stealing from the other subject so that as many subjects stole as did not steal when the confederate had expressed need for money. The previously discussed effects of the confederate's need on the subject's expression of his own need may provide an explanation for these results.

TABLE 20

EFFECT OF CONFEDERATE'S NEED ON STEALING

FROM DISHONEST CONFEDERATE

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Need	No Need	2 16.7%	10 83.3%	12
	Need	7 58.3%	5 41.7%	12
		9	15	24

$Chi^2 = 2.844$, $df = 1$, $p < .10$

TABLE 21

EFFECT OF CONFEDERATE'S NEED ON STEALING FROM THE

OTHER SUBJECT WHEN THE CONFEDERATE WAS DISHONEST

		Stealing		
		Subject did not steal	Subject stole	
Need	No Need	11 91.7%	1 8.3%	12
	Need	6 50.0%	6 50.0%	12
		17	7	24

$Chi^2 = 3.22$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$

Additional Findings

Two additional variables were examined: the subject's estimate of the amount of money he stole and a comparison of the amount of money stolen in the first and second halves of the experiment.

It was found that subjects generally underestimated the amount of money they had stolen with a mean estimate of 5.81 cents as compared to the actual mean of 7.88 cents. It is interesting to note that in relation to the subjects underestimating the amount stolen, none of the subjects spontaneously reported to the experimenter that they had stolen and only one subject reported that the confederate had stolen in the first competition against the other subject. These results may have some bearing on studies concerned with reporting of crimes. (Latane and Darley, 1970).

An attempt was made to determine when the subject was most likely to begin stealing from his opponent. It was found that while more stealing occurred in the second half of the experiment, the difference in the amounts stolen was not significant (mean for first half = 3.43 cents; mean for second half = 4.45 cents).

It may have been the case that subjects stole more toward the end of the five minute competition because of the realization that they were losing. To examine this possibility, a repeated measures analysis of variance was carried out with the amounts of money stolen in the first and second halves of the time period serving as the repeated observations. It was found that the two halves differed significantly ($F = 4.30$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .05$) with more money being stolen in the second half. Generally, most subjects who stole

followed the same pattern of intermittent stealing throughout the experiment with only two subjects stealing for the entire experiment. Since the confederate stole intermittently, it is possible that modelling effected the pattern of stealing.

In addition, the two time periods interacted significantly with need ($F = 5.41$, $df = 1/88$, $p < .05$). Cell means for this interaction are shown in Table 22. Differences in the two time periods were found not to be significantly effected by the other variables.

TABLE 22

INTERACTION OF CONFEDERATE'S NEED WITH AMOUNTS OF MONEY STOLEN IN TWO TIME PERIODS

		Time Periods	
		First Half	Second Half
Confederate's Need	Need	3.29¢	5.46¢
	No Need	3.56¢	3.44¢

It is clear from Table 22 that the increase in theft in the second half of the session occurred for those subjects exposed to the needy confederate. It could be that as subjects realize they are losing, they look for a convenient rationale for stealing which is provided by confederate's professed need for money. This is supported by the fact that subjects reported a greater need for money when the confederate needed money.

Discussion

The purpose of Chapter III was to present the major findings of the study. Considerable additional information was produced by the study but since it was not of major importance to the hypotheses, this information is not extensively presented in the thesis. As well, the study provided the experimenter with interesting observations and impressions regarding people's behavior in experimental situations.

The purpose of Chapter IV is to discuss the results presented in this Chapter in comparison with the hypotheses presented in Chapter I and to provide some possible explanations for the outcomes of the study.

TABLE 24

RANKING OF CONDITIONS BY RATES OF STEALING OBSERVED

	S's Potential Victim			
	Confederate		Third Person	
Confederate's Rationale	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate
Need	4	3	6	2
No Need	6	1	6	5

1 = Condition yielding the greatest likelihood of theft

8 = Condition yielding the least likelihood of theft

The above rankings are also reflected in the mean amounts of money stolen in each of the conditions.

TABLE 25

RANKING OF CONDITIONS BY MEAN AMOUNTS OF MONEY STOLEN (IN CENTS)

	S's Potential Victim			
	Confederate		Other Subject	
Confederate's Rationale	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate	Honest Confederate	Dishonest Confederate
Need	8.33 (4)	12.25 (3)	0.0 (6)	14.42 (2)
No Need	0.0 (6)	24.67 (1)	0.0 (6)	3.33 (5)

Numbers in brackets represent rankings

A comparison of the rankings derived from the actual rates of stealing and mean amounts stolen to the predicted rankings summarized in Table 1, shows a somewhat different picture than was expected. The purpose of the following discussion will be to examine the results and point out the major implications of the findings for the issues and hypotheses discussed in Chapter I. In addition, the limitations of the study will be discussed and suggestions made which would improve the experiment itself and allow for more explanation of the results.

Discussion of the Results of the Study. The major contention of the thesis, that victims of crimes play an important role in their own victimization is supported by the results of the study. Table 6 shows that regardless of all other conditions, more subjects stole when their victim was the confederate. This indicates that information about the victim provided in the experiment did in fact have an impact on the subject's decision to steal.

Regarding the particular characteristics of the victim chosen in this study, the predicted influence of the victim's moral behavior is supported. Moral behavior was found to be the best predictor of theft with the most stealing occurring from the confederate when he had been dishonest. Table 5 shows that significantly more stealing occurred when subjects were exposed to the deviant model. This is particularly true when the confederate himself is the victim (see Table 9).

The effects of the victim's need were found to be somewhat confusing. Two issues require discussion: the apparent lack of a substantial influence of the confederate's need on stealing from him, and the unexpected influence this factor had on stealing from the other subject.

While the confederate's need was expected to substantially decrease the amount of theft from him, this was found not to be the case. Recent work in equity theory (Walster, Berscheid and Walster, 1973) may prove useful in providing an explanation of these results. An equity situation could be maintained if the confederate stole but had a good excuse for doing so, i.e., his need for money. In this case, it is possible that the confederate's need for money was not accepted as a legitimate rationale for his dishonesty and consequently an equity situation was not maintained. Subjects would then be expected to steal from him in order to re-establish equity in the situation. The amount of money involved was extremely small (less than $2.00) and perhaps could not be regarded as being of any major consequence to the confederate's expressed need.

On the other hand, it is possible that subjects rationalized that the confederate had already won once and could therefore afford the loss in the second competition. This explanation is also consistent with equity theory. Unfortunately, the information obtained in the study does not provide a basis for distinguishing between the two explanations.

Contrary to expectations, the confederate's expressed need for money increased both the rate of stealing and the mean amount of

money stolen from the other subject. Table 13 shows that when the confederate said he need money, almost as many subjects stole from the other subject as from the confederate. In fact, this condition ranks second in terms of the rates of stealing and amount of money stolen (see Tables 22 and 24). It appears that while subjects tended to reject need as a rationale for the confederate's theft, it did provide a convenient excuse for their own theft from the other subject. This is supported by the fact that subjects expressed the greatest personal need for money when the confederate had said he needed money and when their opponent was the other subject.

The other unexpected finding is the amount of stealing that occurred from the confederate when he was the most morally credible model. That is, when the confederate needed money and overcame the temptation to steal, it was expected that very little, if any, stealing would occur from him. Table 22 shows that this condition ranks fourth in terms of the amount of stealing. Although the actual numbers are small, it is interesting that more subjects stole from the confederate in this condition than from the other subject when a deviant model was provided. It is possible that stealing from the honest, needy confederate was influenced by the fact that he had already won once. On an equity basis, the fact that the subject stole could be balanced by the fact that the confederate had already won. Obviously, the confederate's need for money did not raise the expected sympathy for his needy condition and consequently was not important enough to prohibit theft.

When subjects were presented with the most deviant victim, the dishonest and non-needy confederate, the results were the most straightforward. Both the highest rate of stealing and the greatest amount of money stolen occurred in this condition. This is likely due to the fact that the combination of the two factors would produce a completely negative picture of the confederate's character. Not only did he steal from the other subject, but he had no apparent reason for doing so. In addition to these factors, he has already won his first competition through cheating and deserves to lose to the real subject. Thus stealing from the confederate represents the subject's attempt to re-establish equity in the situation.

The results of the study seem to indicate that one particular characteristic of the victim may not be as important a predictor of theft as the overall picture and impression which the subject has of his victim. Hence, when all the factors involved in the experiment produce the impression of a completely deviant victim, as indicated above, stealing is most likely. When the factors do not fit together in such a consistent manner to produce a substantial overall impression, victimization is more difficult to predict. In real situations, this would seem to be the case. It is unlikely that victims are chosen for crimes because of any one particular characteristic. Rather, the combination of several factors and the effect this has on the equity of a particular situation is likely the best predictor of victimization. The evidence from this study, however, indicates that the victim's moral behavior is one of the most important factors determining the overall impression of the victim.

Limitations of the Study. Although the results of the study tend to support the major contention of the effects of victims in criminal situations, several limitations are evident and warrant discussion.

While the results of the experiment indicate that the nature of the victim does have an important determining effect on victimization, the experiment itself does not allow us to explain how this effect operates or, particularly, what type of an effect it is. In Chapter I, the issue of whether the effect of the characteristics of a particular victim represents a modelling effect, an effect of some form of judgment of the victim, or some combination of modelling and judgment, was briefly discussed. Unfortunately, the present study does not adequately allow for discrimination between these alternative explanations for victim effects.

It was expected that the manipulation checks could be used as an indication of the subjects' judgments of their victim. However, if this was the case, judgments of the particular victim should be consistent with the stealing behavior observed. In many conditions, this was not the case. For example subjects tended to rate the other subject as more honest when he had been victimized by the dishonest confederate indicating some kind of contrast effect. This judgment, however, is not reflected in stealing behavior since a substantial number of subjects stole from the other subject primarily when the confederate had expressed need for money. While the most stealing occurred when the confederate was dishonest and did not need money, he was not rated as most dishonest in this condition. The highest

dishonesty rating for the confederate occurred in the dishonest but needy condition. Furthermore, a substantial amount of stealing occurred from the honest and needy confederate, the same condition in which the confederate was given the highest honesty rating.

These results appear confusing at the outset. However, it is important to note that, as mentioned in Chapter III, subjects rated their victim on the manipulation checks questionnaire after the experiment itself - after they had decided to either steal or not steal from their victim. Consequently, the judgments indicated in the manipulation checks represent not only the effects of the confederate's behavior, but also the effects of their own stealing behavior and whatever rationalizations they may have used to justify their decision. This is evident from Table 2 which shows that subjects rated the confederate as less dishonest when he was in fact dishonest and did not need the money. Theoretically, this should represent the most unequitable condition and it was expected that the confederate would be regarded as most dishonest. However, this is also the condition in which the most subjects stole. Subjects have consequently re-established the equity of the situation and it is therefore unnecessary for them to rate the confederate as overly dishonest. Because we have no indication of the subjects' judgments prior to their decision to steal or not steal, we can not reach any conclusions regarding the effects of judgments on victimization.

Furthermore, the experiment does not provide an adequate test for modelling effects of the confederate's behavior. As discussed in Chapter I, it was expected that the confederate's own deviant

behavior could have a disinhibitory effect and therefore increase the probability of the subject's stealing, regardless of other factors. If this were the case, more stealing would be expected regardless of whether the victim was the confederate or the other subject. Table 22 shows that more stealing did occur when the subjects were faced with a deviant confederate; however, stealing was also significantly affected by whether the victim was the confederate or the other subject. It appears, then, that the results do not reflect a pure modelling effect but that some judgments of the victim were being made on the basis of the information provided in the experimental situation.

However, conclusions about modelling effects in the present study must be limited since the design of the experiment does not provide an adequate test of the effects of modelling vs. judgment of victim characteristics. It was expected that the conditions involving the other subject as the victim would provide an indication of the modelling effects of a deviant model. Since the subject would have no information about the characteristics of the other subject to justify victimization, theft from the other subject would represent the effect of modelling. However, this explanation is confounded by the fact that in all conditions, the other subject has lost his first competition and in half the conditions has been victimized by the deviant confederate. Stealing from the other subject, then, does not represent a pure modelling effect but involves the effects of his previous victimization and loss as well. Furthermore, stealing from the confederate is confounded by the fact that he wins his

first competition. In order to adequately test the effects of modelling, either a further condition would have to be added in which the other subject wins his first competition or a third victim, one who does not compete at all except against the real subject, could be added as a means of comparison.

Several limitations of the study result from the particular operationalizations of the independent variables which were chosen in the experiment. For example, the confederate's dishonesty in the form of stealing was used as an indicator of his moral behavior. Several problems surround this variable. First, it is questionable whether "dishonesty" is a valid indicator of moral character, particularly in a situation which may have been somewhat conducive to "cheating" and in which only a small amount of money was at stake. Secondly, the operationalization of moral behavior should have been a different kind of behavior than the dependent variable. This would have minimized the modelling effect of the confederate's stealing behavior and allowed for discrimination between possible explanations for the observed rates of stealing. In this study the confederate's deviant behavior likely served as an example of how to win whereas with exposure to an honest model, some subjects likely ignored the possibility of cheating since they were unsure of the consequences. Since the situation may have been conducive to "cheating", it is somewhat unlikely that the confederate's behavior was regarded as serious stealing. The use of a more serious offence would likely have increased the degree to which subjects made judgments about the confederate's general moral character.

The other serious limitation of the independent variables relates to the effects of the need variable. Although the manipulation checks indicate that the subjects recognized the confederate's need for money, there is no indication of their feelings about the seriousness of his need. The results indicate that his need may not have been felt to be serious enough to warrant dishonesty. Secondly, the amount of money involved in the experiment was small of necessity. Such a small amount of money could not have any impact on the confederate's financial situation and therefore, contrary to expectations, did not decrease the amount of stealing from him.

Conclusions. The purpose of this chapter has been to discuss the implications, limitations and issues involved in the experiment and the results obtained.

Generally, the results indicate that victims do have an important effect; however, just exactly how victims determine their own victimization and what kind of an effect they have can not be determined from the experiment, although some inferences can be made. The most important implication appears to be that the subject's decision to steal may reflect an overall impression of his victim. When all the factors known about the victim are consistent and support the same kind of judgment, victimization, or in this case stealing behavior, is predictable. In cases of conflicting information, it is difficult to predict how subjects will fit together the information provided about the victim and consequently, what their overall impression of him will be. Under these circumstances, it is more difficult to predict victimization.

Chapter V will attempt to address the all-important question - "So What?" - where do we go from here and what generalizations can be made about victimization in real situations.

CHAPTER V

SO WHAT?

The above question is perhaps one of the most difficult to address and yet one of the most important questions which can be asked of any such study. Independent research studies with no indication of how their findings link with other similar studies, with general theoretical approaches or with situations in the real world, are of little value or consequence.

With regards to the present study, we can definitely conclude that victims do play an important role - just exactly what this role is, is a slightly different question. The theoretical discussion and review of other studies presented in Chapter I supported the view that the characteristics of a particular victim have an important determining effect in criminal situations - a view which has largely been ignored in both sociological research on deviant behavior and in actual judicial and legal situations where the distinction between perpetrator and victim is enforced.

The study indicates that more attention should be paid to this variable, particularly with regards to explaining how the particular victim affects the perpetrator's behavior. The possibilities of a modelling effect or a judgmental effect were raised but no definite conclusions can be made about which has the most pervasive effect, or how much of the effect was due to modelling - how much due to judgments made of the victim or some combination of both factors. This is the more difficult aspect of victim effects to determine.

The conclusion at the end of Chapter IV was that the overall impression of the victim is the best predictor of victimization. In real situations, this is likely the case. "It is now largely agreed that delinquent (deviant) behavior, like most social behavior, is learned and that it is learned in the process of social interaction" (Homans, 1962). If this is the case, it is unnecessary and in fact, unlikely, that victims provide models for the actual behavior perpetrated against them; but their general nature and the impression which they produce likely reduce the inhibitions against deviant acts. Victims do not have to "teach" their perpetrators how to act through providing them with a model. The deviant behavior likely exists in the person's repertoire of behavior and requires only the provision of a "bad actor" to lower the threshold for deviancy. Hence the general impression of the victim is important. Sykes and Matza have tended to refer to this as a "technique of neutralization" while Cressey talks about "rationalizations". Whichever term is used, the real-life factors are the same - some "trigger" is needed to reduce the normal inhibitions against deviant behavior. In the present study, the victim's character provided the "trigger". This approach is also consistent with equity theory which contends that if a person views a situation as inequitable, he will take appropriate action to restore equity. Results from the present study indicate that more attention should be paid to the effect a victim has on the perceived equity of a particular situation.

The last conclusion must, of necessity, be the same conclusion as is presented in most studies - the need for further research. The

discussion of the limitations of the study outlined in Chapter IV points to some ways in which the experiment could be modified and repeated to test the validity of the findings and focus on particular explanations for victim effects. It would be interesting to supplement the findings of the study with results obtained from a field study or from actuarial data derived from criminal records of actual situations. Furthermore, the importance of victim characteristics and the implications of this factor in legal and judicial situations, must continually be emphasized.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aronson, E. & Mettee, J., "Dishonest Behavior as a Function of Differential Levels of Induced Self-Esteem", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968:9:2:121-127.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H., Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Barnes, H.E. & Teeters, N.K., New Horizons in Criminology. Englewood Cliffs, 1959.

Cressey, D.R.. Other People's Money. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953.

Eisen, M., "Characteristic Self-Esteem, Sex and Resistance to Temptation", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972: 24:1:68-72.

Gibson, E. & Klein, S., "Murder", Home Office Studies in the Causes of Delinquency and the Treatment of Offenders, 4, London, 1961.

Gillies, H., "Murder in the West of Scotland", British Journal of Psychiatry, 111 (1965), 1087-94.

Homans, G.C., Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.

Jacobson, L.I., Berger, S.E., & Millham, J., "Individual Differences in Cheating During a Temptation Period When Confronting Failure", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970:15:1:48-56.

Jones, C. & Aronson, E., "Attribution of Fault to a Rape Victim as a Function of Respectability of the Victim", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973:26:3:415-19.

Krebs, Dennis L., "Altruism - An Examination of the Concepts and A Review of the Literature", Psychological Bulletin, 73 (1970), 4:258-302.

Landy, D. & Aronson, E., "The Influence of the Character of the Criminal and His Victim on the Decisions of Simulated Jurors", Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969:5:141-152.

Latane, Bibb & Darley, J.M., The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help? New York:Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1970.

Lerner, M.J. & Simmons, C.H., "Observer's Reaction to the Innocent Victim: Compassion of Rejection?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966:4:203-210.

Mendelsohn, B., "The Origin of the Doctrine of Victimology", Exerpta Criminologica, 1963:3:239-244.

Nagel, W.H., "The Notion of Victimology in Criminology", Exerpta Criminologica, 1963:3:245-247.

Reckless, W., The Crime Problem, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Smigel, E.O., "Crimes Against Bureaucracy" in Smigel, E.O. & Ross, H.L. Crimes Against Bureaucracy. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970.

Smigel, E.O. & Ross, H.L., Crimes Against Bureaucracy, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., 1970.

Schafer, S., The Victim and His Criminal, New York: Random House, 1968.

Schultz, LeRoy, "The Victim-Offender Relationship", Crime and Delinquency, 1968:14:135-141.

Sykes, G.M. & Matza, D., "Techniques of Delinquency" in Wolfgang, M.E., Savitz, L. & Johnston, N. The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970, pp. 292-299.

Sykes, G.M. & Matza, D., "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency", American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), pp. 664-670.

Walster, E., Berscheid, E., & Walster, G.W., "New Directions in Equity Research", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973:25:2:151-176.

Wolfgang, M.E., Patterns in Criminal Homicide, Philadelphia, 1958.

Von Hentig, H., The Criminal and His Victim: Studies in the Sociobiology of Crime, Yale University Press, 1948.

APPENDIX A

MANIPULATION CHECK QUESTIONNAIRE

In this questionnaire, we are concerned with whether or not you took points from the subject you competed against and what were your reasons for doing so. Your responses to this questionnaire will have no bearing on the amount of money you receive.

1. Which subject did you compete against?

   a. Subject 1 _____

   b. Subject 2 _____

2. Did Subject 1 cheat from Subject 2 on the competitive task which you watched?

   a. no _____

   b. yes _____

3. Did Subject 1 need the money?

   a. no _____

   b. yes _____

4. What did you think of Subject1? Check what you consider to be Subject 1's position on the following list of adjective pairs.

1. intelligent	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unintelligent
2. likeable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unlikeable
3. cooperative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	uncooperative
4. bossy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	easygoing
5. immature	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	mature
6. imaginative	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unimaginative
7. responsible	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	irresponsible
8. nervous	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	calm
9. reasonable	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unreasonable
10.patient	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	impatient
11.rigid	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	flexible
12.courteous	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	rude
13.selfish	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unselfish
14.warm	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	cold
15.sincere	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	insincere
16.trusting	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	distrustful
17.friendly	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unfriendly
18.honest	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	dishonest
19.fair	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	unfair
20.competent	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	incompetent
21.lazy	_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:	energetic

5. What did you think of Subject2? Check what you consider to be Subject 2's position on the following list of adjective pairs.

1.	intelligent	: : : : : : :	unintelligent
2.	likeable	: : : : : : :	unlikeable
3.	cooperative	: : : : : : :	uncooperative
4.	bossy	: : : : : : :	easygoing
5.	immature	: : : : : : :	mature
6.	imaginative	: : : : : : :	unimaginative
7.	responsible	: : : : : : :	irresponsible
8.	nervous	: : : : : : :	calm
9.	reasonable	: : : : : : :	unreasonable
10.	patient	: : : : : : :	impatient
11	rigid	: : : : : : :	flexible
12.	courteous	: : : : : : :	rude
13.	selfish	: : : : : : :	unselfish
14.	warm	: : : : : : :	cold
15.	sincere	: : : : : : :	insincere
16.	trusting	: : : : : : :	distrustful
17.	friendly	: : : : : : :	unfriendly
18.	honest	: : : : : : :	dishonest
19,	fair	: : : : : : :	unfair
20.	competent	: : : : : : :	incompetent
21.	lazy	: : : : : : :	energetic

6. Did you take points from the subject you competed against?

   a. no _____

   b. yes _____

7. If yes, when did you begin taking points?

   a. at the beginning of the experiment _____

   b. during the experiment _____

   c. towards the end of the experiment _____

   d. I did not take points _____

8. If you took points from the other subject, how much do you think you took? _____

9. Do you need the money from this experiment?

   a. no _____

   b. yes _____

10. Would yo consider yourself:

   a. financially well-off _____

   b. financially moderate _____

   c. financially poor _____

   d. in desperate need of money _____

11. What is your financial situation?

   well-off _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: in desperate need

12. What were your reasons for taking or not taking from the subject you competed against?

APPENDIX B

VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT

Basic Script - The videotape begins with the confederate seated at a desk in front of the button-pressing machine. Confederate is finishing the self-esteem questionnaire when E enters.

E "Have you finished those questionnaires?"

(E refers to self-esteem questionnaires)

C "Yes".

(C gives questionnaires to E)

E "Thanks. I'll now give you the instructions for the experiment".

(E reads the following instructions)

"In this experiment, we are concerned with people's behavior in different types of situations - in this case, it's a competitive situation. Three of you, we'll call you Subject 1, Subject 2 and Subject 3, have been randomly chosen to compete in this experiment and have been randomly assigned to three separate rooms. We want to avoid any direct interaction between you so we've put you each in separate rooms. You will be called Subject 3. Also on the basis of random selection, the following order of competitions has been set up. First, you will compete against Subject 2. In order to cut down on the number of subjects needed, one of you will be randomly selected to compete twice. You'll find out after the first competition whether you have been randomly chosen to compete again."

"Before we get started, I'd like to ask you a few questions. We're interested in people's reasons for signing up for these experiments; why some people sign up while others don't. Did you know you would be paid for taking part in this experiment?"

No Need Condition -

C *"No I didn't"*

Need Condition -

C *"No I didn't but I could sure use it"*

E "What were your reasons for signing up?"

C "I was just curious to see what happens in these experiments".

E "Okay, you have a chance to make some money on the competitive task. Do you need the money?"

No Need Condition -

C *"No, I really don't need the money".*

Need Condition -

C *"Yes, I do. I'm really getting short of money".*

(C briefly comments casually about his financial situation)

E "Okay. The competitive task is actually very simple. (E points to button pressing machine and camera focuses on machine only). "All you have to do is press this button as

often as you can for five minutes. Your score will be recorded automatically on this counter (E points to counter labelled "Own Score") and your opponent's score will show on this counter (E points to counter labelled "Opponent's Score"). Each point on either counter corresponds to one cent. In order to receive the money on your counter, you have to beat the person you're competing against. If you lose, you'll receive nothing".

C "What's this switch for?"

(C points to switch labelled "Work Alone" above and "Take Other's Money" below)

E "That switch is being used for another experiment; I think it has something to do with cooperation. If that switch is flipped to the "Take Other's Money" position, (E flips the switch to that position) all your opponent's points are recorded on your own counter."

C "I see - but that's not part of this experiment."

E "No. Do you have any other questions?"

C "No - nothing I can think of."

E "Okay. This light (E points to light on panel) will come on when it's time for you to begin. I'll come back when the competition is over. Remember you're competing against Subject 2 this time". (E leaves the room. The

camera focuses on the panel only. After a short interval, the light comes on and C begins to press the button on the panel).

Dishonest Condition

(C continues to press the button for approximately two minutes, then flips the switch to the "Take Other's Money" position and stops pressing the button. The picture clearly shows his counter continue to increase while his opponent's counter stops increasing. For the remainder of the five minutes, C continues to flip the switch intermittently between the two positions).

Honest Condition

(C continues to press the button for the entire five minutes).

E (When the competition is over, E re-enters the room).

"I see you've won the first competition. Congratulations. I'll pay you all the money you've won at the end of the experiment".

Confederate Competes Against Real Subject

E *"You've also been randomly selected to compete again, this time against Subject 1. The task is exactly the same. The light will come on when it's time for you to begin. I'll be back after the competition to pay*

you the money you've won and give you a short questionnaire I'd like you to fill out."

(E leaves the room and the videotape ends).

Real Subject Competes against Subject 2

E *"Subject 2 has been randomly chosen to compete again, this time against Subject 1. I'd like you to fill out this short questionnaire then come out to the office so I can pay you the money."*

(E gives C the questionnaire then leaves the room and the videotape ends).

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR AMOUNT OF MONEY STOLEN

	Variable	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	F
Main Effects	Victim	1,134.38	1	4.70
	Moral Behavior	3,220.16	1	13.34
	Need	73.50	1	.30
Two-way Interactions	Victim x Need	345.04	1	1.43
	Victim x Moral Behavior	176.04	1	.73
	Moral Behavior x Need	140.16	1	.58
Three-way Interactions	Victim x Moral Behavior x Need	1,520.04	1	6.30
Covariate	Subjects Need for Money	122.53	1	.50